

and in *Cyclophorus crocatus*, and to "some details of the anatomy" of *Otopoma* contained in ten lines on p. 30. The radulae also of this genus and two species of *Tropidophora* are described. There are some slight inaccuracies in the nomenclature, which is scarcely up to date; for example, it has been pointed out in these 'Annals' as long ago as 1891 that the name *Cyclostoma* can no longer be used for the genus of operculated land-shells to which it has generally been applied, and therefore the family name "Cyclostomidae," which should be Cyclostomatidae, also becomes obsolete. *Cyclostoma elegans* is more than once erroneously referred to as the type of *Cyclostoma*, and mention is made (p. 34) of a viviparous *Bulimus* at Aden. Three writers at least within the last few years have pointed out that Scopoli did not originally apply this term to a land-shell, but to a freshwater form. There is also a mistake with regard to the authorship of the 'Catalogue of Phaneropneumona or Terrestrial Operculated Mollusca in the Collection of the British Museum,' to which attention should be directed. It is several times referred to as Gray's work, whereas, as stated in the preface, it was prepared by Dr. L. Pfeiffer. In speaking of the subdivision of the genus *Cyclophorus* ten so-called subgenera are enumerated. No mention, however, is made of *Crossopoma*, Crosse, *Ptychopoma*, Möllendorff, *Japonia*, Gould, *Aferulus*, Martens, *Ostodes*, Gould, and some other groups, so that we are left in ignorance as to the author's views respecting these sections. The statement with regard to the distribution of the *Pupinæ* (p. 37) is not accurate, as certain members of the group occur in Japan, Formosa, and as far eastward as the Solomon Islands, New Hebrides, and Fiji Islands.

The seven plates, drawn by the author, do not possess a highly artistic finish, but this is probably compensated by the accuracy of outline of the figures and the true indication of the sculpture. The drawings of the soft parts (plates lxvii. and lxviii.), although characteristic perhaps, do not exhibit the precision and clear definition usually furnished by the anatomist.

As a contribution to Indian malacology this work undoubtedly possesses a certain value which recommends its continuation; moreover, the author having lived and personally worked in the country, is in a position to speak with special authority upon the Indian fauna.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Pierine Butterflies of the Genus Terias.

To the Editors of the 'Annals and Magazine of Natural History.'

GENTLEMEN,—In my article on *Terias* I omitted to erase *T. hainana*, Moore (*suprà*, p. 63), as a synonym of *T. bethesba*, which it superficially resembles, though actually a form of *T. libythea*.

I am, Gentlemen,

Yours &c.,

A. G. BUTLER.

“*Butterflies from the Pacific Islands.*”

To the Editors of the ‘*Annals and Magazine of Natural History.*’

GENTLEMEN,—In answer to Mr. Sclater’s letter of December 2nd, published in your last number, I have to make the following remarks.

I find on referring to my edition of Mr. Keith Johnston’s Atlas that the Timor group, New Guinea, and the Solomon Islands are all included in his map of “The Islands of the Pacific Ocean”—so that, if I have erred, I have erred in good company.

I venture to think that Mr. Sclater’s observations, in which he accuses me of a “serious geographical error,” are somewhat hypercritical. The islands in question, being situated in the Pacific Ocean, may not inaptly be termed Pacific Islands, though they are separated by more or less considerable distances from other groups of islands, which are more in the centre of the Pacific Ocean. I am not acquainted with any authority which restricts the term “Pacific Islands” to these last-named groups; but even though there be such authority, I still think that the title to my series of papers on the butterflies found in the numerous islands of Oceania, with the last of which series Mr. Sclater has found fault, is sufficiently accurate for the purpose for which the papers were written. They were prepared for the perusal of entomologists, and I think I am not far wrong in supposing that no entomologist would be misled by the title, though such title might not, technically, satisfy a geographer.

The title appears to me adequate, and sufficiently accurate to indicate to entomologists, *in general terms*, the quarter of the globe in which the butterflies were captured. If this be so, my object in thus designating my papers has been attained.

I hope I may never be accused of a more “serious error” than that which Mr. Sclater has attributed to me.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient Servant,

H. GROSE-SMITH.

5 Bryanston Square, W.

8th January, 1898.

Note on the Genera Choristoneura, Mabille, and Katreus, Watson.

By F. A. HERON.

Dr. W. J. Holland in his most useful “Preliminary Revision and Synonymic Catalogue of the Hesperiidæ of Africa and the adjacent Islands,” in the Proc. Zool. Soc. 1896, p. 74, quotes the genus *Katreus*, Watson, with its type species *Astictopterus Johnstonii*, Butler, Proc. Zool. Soc. 1887, p. 573, and also a figure of his own in the ‘Entomological News,’ vol. v., Jan. 1894, pl. i. f. 8, as representing Butler’s species, and gives a further reference to Proc. Zool. Soc. 1896, pl. ii. fig 18. This figure was afterwards correctly ascribed to *Gorqyra abura*, Plötz, by Karsch in a note on Holland’s paper published in Ent. Nachr. xxii. p. 377 (1896).

On page 83 of his Revision occurs the mention of the genus *Choristoneura*, Mabille, a coloured figure of the type *Choristoneura apicalis*, Mab., being given on pl. v. f. 1, and a cut of the neuriation

on page 83, with the following note:—"This very remarkable insect is entirely unlike any other species which I have ever seen from the African continent, and recalls in general appearance some of the species of the S. American genus *Entheus*. At the time Lieut. Watson prepared his Revision of the genera of the Hesperiidæ, no specimen of this insect was available by him for purposes of study. I take pleasure in incorporating a cut giving the neuriation. From this it will be seen by the student that the neuriation is quite peculiar, and that Mons. Mabilie, the author of the genus, was abundantly justified by the facts in erecting it for the reception of the typical species."

A reference to Watson's paper, Proc. Zool. Soc. 1893, p. 130, shows *Choristoneura*, Mab., type *apicalis*, Mab., among the genera "of which the types are not in the British Museum," and which consequently he was "unable to identify."

If the student compares together the excellent figure of *Choristoneura apicalis*, Mab., in Proc. Zool. Soc. 1896, pl. v. f. 1, and Mabilie's very short description of his species in Bull. Soc. Ent. Fr. (6) vol. ix. p. clvi (1889), with Butler's description of *Astictopterus Johnstonii*, Proc. Zool. Soc. 1887, p. 573, he will at once notice that figure and description refer to the same form, which must therefore stand as *Johnstonii*, Butler.

A similar comparison of Mabilie's slight definition of *Choristoneura* in the 'Bulletin,' and the cut of neuriation given by Holland on p. 83, Proc. Zool. Soc. 1896, with Watson's more detailed definition of *Katreus*, P. Z. S. 1893, p. 115, will show the identity of *Choristoneura* and *Katreus*.

Karsch, in the communication referred to above, had recognized his own *Loxolexis percnoptera* from Barombi as a synonym of *Choristoneura apicalis*, Mab., by the aid of the figures given by Holland.

The species will thus stand as *Choristoneura Johnstonii*, Butler (*apicalis*, Mabilie), and the fuller synonymy will be:—

Choristoneura, Mabilie, Bull. Soc. Ent. Fr. (6) ix. p. clvi (1889). Type *apicalis*, Mabilie.

Katreus, Watson, Proc. Zool. Soc. 1893, p. 115. Type *Johnstonii*, Butler.

Loxolexis, Karsch, Ent. Nachr. xxi. p. 320 (1895). Type *percnoptera*, Karsch.

Astictopterus Johnstonii, Butler, Proc. Zool. Soc. 1887, p. 573.

Choristoneura apicalis, Mabilie, Bull. Soc. Ent. Fr. (6) ix. p. clvi (1889).

Katreus Johnstonii, Watson, Proc. Zool. Soc. 1893, p. 115 (nec Holland, Ent. News, v. pl. i. f. 8, 1894; nec Holland, Proc. Zool. Soc. 1896, pl. ii. f. 18).

Loxolexis percnoptera, Karsch, Ent. Nachr. xxi. p. 321 (1895).

Choristoneura apicalis, Holland, Proc. Zool. Soc. 1896, pl. v. f. 1.

From the plate alone I am unable to say to what genus we must assign the species figured as *Katreus Johnstonii* by Holland, Ent. News, v. pl. i. fig. 8; but if the species prove new, it should certainly be described by the learned doctor, who in his recent paper has done so much to facilitate the study of the African Hesperiid fauna.

Martyn's 'Psyche.' By OLIVER E. JANSON, F.E.S.

In the January number of the 'Annals' Mr. Sherborn, in his "Note on Thomas Martyn's 'Psyche,' 1797," states that Mr. Van de Poll and Mr. Janson had not responded to his letters asking for information respecting the copy of this exceedingly rare work that was contained in my late father's library, and now in the possession of Mr. Van de Poll. As regards myself, I certainly never received any letter from him upon the subject, but believe he called at my office during my absence and made some vague enquiry of one of my assistants respecting the copy of the work, which had then passed out of my possession and had been in Holland, with Mr. Van de Poll, for several years; but as he left neither a name or address, I was unable to communicate with him, and was under the impression that he intended to call again or write to me; and had he done so I should have been only too glad to avail myself of the opportunity of giving him any information I was able to, and also to have allowed him to inspect the first two numbers of the work now in my possession, the second of which he states in his "Note" he has never seen, and wishes to hear about from anyone who may possess it. These two parts of the work with the original text are those he refers to under copy "No. 9," which he states were sold to Messrs. Dulau in 1888 and "not traced since." As a matter of fact they were purchased by me from Dr. A. G. Butler in March 1890 and bear his autograph. These parts are both in the original wrappers, evidently as issued. No. 1 agrees with the collation given by Mr. Sherborn and No. 2 consists of text sign. D, pp. 7 and 8 in English, and the same sign. and pp. repeated in French—page 7 in each case devoted to the description of "*Papilio daphnis*?" and page 8 to that of "*Papilio crespontinus*," both species being figured on the accompanying plates.

The existence of the copy "No. 10" of Mr. Sherborn's list has probably arisen from some mistake, as Dr. Butler informs me he has no means of knowing what books Mr. Van de Poll possesses and has no recollection of having mentioned such a copy; it would therefore appear that the copy of the second part in my possession is the only one so far known to exist, and I shall be glad to allow anyone free access to it who may wish to consult it.

I entirely disagree with Mr. Sherborn in regarding the work as a manuscript; the first two numbers he must, at all events, admit are a regularly published work, and as regards the remaining twenty-eight plates, he admits they have been printed from engraved copper-plates and that a certain number of copies were issued, so that I cannot see why the mere fact of the names of the species having been omitted in the printing and filled in afterwards by hand should be sufficient grounds for regarding the whole as a manuscript. Even if no further portion of text should come to light, I believe it is generally held by naturalists that a good recognizable figure is quite as efficient to carry publication of a species as a printed description.

Highgate, N.
January 8th, 1893.